

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: CHANTIX (VARENICLINE) PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 2092

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO –32)

On October 1, 2009, the Panel transferred 34 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407. *See* 655 F.Supp.2d 1346 (J.P.M.L. 2009). Since that time, 82 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Northern District of Alabama. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Inge P Johnson.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Northern District of Alabama and assigned to Judge Johnson.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. §1407 to the Northern District of Alabama for the reasons stated in the order of October 1, 2009, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Inge P Johnson.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

FOR THE PANEL:



Jeffery N. Lüthi
Clerk of the Panel

Inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.

Mar 04, 2013

CLERK'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

**IN RE: CHANTIX (VARENICLINE) PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2092

SCHEDULE CTO-32 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>
NEVADA			
NV	2	13-00259	Taylor et al v. Pfizer, Inc.